

APPENDIX A

SUMMARIES OF THE BSSC MEETINGS
IN CHARLESTON, MEMPHIS, ST. LOUIS, AND SEATTLE

CHARLESTON

It was noted that many persons in Charleston believe there will eventually be another serious seismic event but do not have any understanding of what it would do. It also was noted that when adopting improved seismic requirements, one must make sure that the average person does not assume that the use of a building code incorporating seismic considerations will eliminate all damage. It must be emphasized that codes only provide for "minimums" and that their purpose is life safety; seismic code requirements generally are aimed at saving occupants by preventing major structural collapse but are not intended to eliminate property damage.

It was stated that often new construction and even renovation work is done by speculative developers who have no lasting association with the buildings and that buyers therefore must be taught what questions to ask about building seismic safety. Further, many building officials need to be made aware of the seismic hazard, especially since many of them do not have engineering training.

It was explained that prior to 1981, even though the county had adopted the Standard Building Code, which includes seismic provisions for new buildings, enforcement was spotty. Since that time, an ordinance ordering their enforcement has been passed. It was noted, however, that because of the historical nature of much of Charleston, replacement of the existing building stock with new and, hence, seismic-resistant structures will occur quite slowly--that is, while a complete turnover of buildings could be expected to occur in about 100 years in most cities, it will probably take about 300 years in Charleston. It was also noted that some contractors prefer not to work in Charleston or in the county but that is simply because it is cheaper to work in nearby areas where there are no codes at all, not because of the seismic requirements of the city and county. Costs were also discussed to some extent and the need for cost-benefit analyses was mentioned.

Considerable discussion focused on the South Carolina Seismic Safety Consortium headquartered at The Citadel. This organization involves 120 representatives from a variety of professions and interest groups; members come from Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia as well as South Carolina. It was described as a grass roots but coordinated approach to action. The major activities of the consortium involve digesting available information, data and technology and repackaging it in different forms for various audiences (e.g., building community professionals and homeowners). It was noted that the consortium's work has highlighted the need for technical information, vulnerability analyses, and technology transfer. The consortium believes it has three main audiences

Currently in force in the city of Charleston is the 1982 Standard Building Code (SBC). Although the SBC incorporate ANSI A58.1-1972 for seismic design if required by local building authorities, at the time of the BSSC trial design effort, the city of Charleston building authority recommended that the more recent ANSI A58.1-1982 be used for its seismic requirements.

to consider when preparing educational information: the general public, the building official, and the architects and engineers. It was further noted that the professional community shares in the responsibility to make the public aware.

With respect to the impact of new or improved seismic provisions on regulatory practices, it was stated that the critical stage is design review. Since inspectors only determine if things are being constructed in accordance with plans and specifications, they would require little if any specialized training. If that is not the case, it is up to the building official to take action. In fact, it was suggested that the building officials ought to take someone found to be in violation of the code to court every now and then just to keep everyone on their toes.

Many questions arose about costs, some focusing on those related to actions providing for more than structural integrity. The tentative nature and form of the cost data presented at this meeting led the participants to conclude that the projections of cost derived from the trial designs probably represented minimums. The participants also indicated that they would like to have cost-benefit data as well as comparative data concerning what seismic protection would cost in comparison with protection from other hazards. Some wondered just how much a building owner would be willing to invest in seismic protection when there do not appear to be any financial incentives like those provided by the insurance industry for fire protection. The subject of whether it is a lessening of property damage or life safety that the insurance industry is trying to stimulate was discussed.

Some believed that the NEHRP Recommended Provisions are designed to address the worst case and frequent problem areas like those in California. It was suggested that in areas like those in the East where earthquakes are possible but not probable, use of the NEHRP Recommended Provisions would tend to overprotect low-density areas and underprotect high-density ones.

A discussion of the model codes led one participant to maintain that the best way to implement the NEHRP Recommended Provisions would be to get them incorporated in the model codes. It was noted that local government probably will not act without strong pressure from somewhere and that consensus by the building community is a necessary first step.

The lack of public awareness of the earthquake threat in Memphis was discussed at length. It was stated that even most Memphis building professionals believe the likelihood of life loss due to earthquake is remote. Since the community has limited resources and wants to attract new industry to provide more jobs and a bigger tax base, it is feared that any increase in building costs would prompt businesses to go somewhere cheaper. It also is feared that many economically marginal buildings simply would not be built at all if higher rents would have to be charged.

It was noted that some Memphis buildings are being designed with seismic protection that not required by the local code and that this shows that at least some people recognize the risk and are willing to pay for protection. It also was stated that lenders sometimes require seismic resistant design and that the expanding use of computers and other sensitive electronic equipment may attract tenants to protected buildings and permit premium rents to be charged. (Such determinations, however, are difficult to make in that one does not know whether it is the seismic protection or just the prestige of a new building that is attracting tenants.)

Currently in force in the city of Memphis and in Shelby County is the Standard Building Code (SBC), 1982, with adopted revisions (which include no seismic requirements) and with seismic design requirements excluded.

There was considerable discussion of the negligence/liability issue. It was explained that since a body of scientific knowledge regarding the earthquake threat is available, earthquakes can no longer be considered "acts of God." When the technical literature shows that there is a risk, a building owner or developer or even a regulatory or other community agency might well be considered negligent if an earthquake occurs and fatalities result, even if there is no building code requirement for seismic protection. The issue might be further complicated if some buildings in a community are designed to be seismic resistant. It was noted that this precedent has not yet been tested in court specifically concerning earthquakes but that it has for other natural phenomena.

Great concern was expressed that enactment of seismic provisions for new buildings would necessitate something being done for some existing buildings, particularly schools and other critical or high-occupancy buildings, and that the cost of such retrofit would be extremely high. It also was noted that problems could arise if the general public became overly sensitive to the earthquake hazard. Information about experiences in other places with similar risks was requested.

Some maintained that the life safety issue is of paramount importance and that studies show that many more people would be injured or killed if an earthquake occurred during the day rather than at night. It was noted, however, that few lives have been lost due to earthquakes in the United States during the past 100 years and that people therefore are unaware of or ignore the potential risk, deeming it to be of little significance to them. In addition, although one can speculate about what the damage would be from specific seismic events, no one knows for sure what will happen and this uncertainty contributes to apathy.

With respect to enforcement of seismic code provisions, it was noted that considerable training of building inspectors and probably additional inspectors would be required. One alternative might be to have the designer provide for the inspection.

ST. LOUIS

Questions arose concerning the existing degree of seismic risk actually present and the probabilities of a major seismic event over time. Questions also focused on the sorts of effects to be expected from various degrees of shaking since the geology of the eastern United States is different from that of the West.

Considerable attention was paid to the architectural or nonstructural damage that might occur and whether the NEHRP Recommended Provisions would eliminate such damage in the future. Similarly, concern was expressed about the possibility of fire damage and whether it might not cause far more damage and deaths than structural collapse. Further, many were concerned about the "interface" area and whether necessary critical facilities would be operational after a seismic event even if they did not collapse.

Another major concern was that providing seismic-resistant structures would increase the average building cost and, therefore, a jurisdiction enforcing seismic provisions would be at a disadvantage relative to neighboring jurisdictions that did not enforce seismic provisions. Any resulting increase in rents was deemed to be of special importance since it might well reduce the market and result in a loss of rental income to the owner, tax revenue, and jobs.

Much discussion was focused on public awareness of seismic risk. It was generally believed that awareness is developing among St. Louis building community professionals and, to a limited extent, among the general public. All seemed to believe that what is needed is awareness without alarm and that the public must be made aware that it is not now protected. Many seemed to think that public officials were not convinced that there is a risk. It also was noted that the adoption of seismic provisions for new construction would raise questions concerning retrofit of existing structures; the retrofit issue poses special problems because of the relatively high costs and great number of buildings thought to be involved. Some maintained that clear cost-benefit data are of major importance, but others felt that the economics are somewhat irrelevant since public safety must be guaranteed whatever the cost.

The question of liability also arose. The discussion reflected the fact that it is difficult to reach agreement on how much one is obligated to do. It was pointed out that most large industrial organizations concern themselves with seismic design because they do not want to experience either a shutdown or life loss but that the speculative developer is concerned only about his market and, hence, would resist anything that would increase costs. Many seemed to believe that public officials need to be made aware that the courts most likely would hold them just as liable as a building designer or owner if an earthquake occurred and lives were lost.

Currently in force in St. Louis is the Building Officials and Code Administrator's (BOCA) Basic Building Code with no enforcement of seismic requirements.

Economic incentives to promote seismic design were deemed to be needed. Many thought that the insurance industry should encourage seismic safety the way it does fire safety. Concern by mortgage bankers also was considered important.

SEATTLE

The discussion revealed that because Seattle already has seismic provisions in its code, there probably would be little enthusiasm for changing to incorporate the NEHRP Recommended Provisions. In addition, it was noted that any current concern about seismic regulations in Seattle is related to existing construction and enforcement.

With respect to costs, the participants warned those in communities without seismic provisions about several points: (1) incredibly erroneous statements are made about how much seismic protection increases costs, (2) the speculative developer will resist any increase in costs and will be as shortsighted as the buyer will permit him to be, and (3) sometimes a small design change can cost a lot. One participant asked if there were any data available on life-cycle costs for buildings with seismic protection that might reveal secondary benefits and another wondered whether the structure's useful life would be extended.

The fact that some financial institutions are requiring seismic design and insurance was mentioned. Questions arose about whether the insurance industry really recognizes the benefits of seismic protection and whether seismic protection is acknowledged in company rate structures. If so, it was thought that this would be an economic incentive for owners.

Much of the discussion focused on the importance of awareness and education. It was noted that even government officials, scientists, and building community professionals lack a clear awareness of the problem. It was mentioned that the general knowledge many have of the California earthquake situation presents a problem because people assume there is no risk in their area because there is no obvious active fault zone like the San Andreas.

It was stated that public officials and community decision-makers must understand the problem if they are to be able to respond effectively to their constituents once awareness develops. With respect to the general public, they must be made aware of the seismic hazard, but in ways that suggest that there is something they can do about the it.

In a community with no seismic-resistant building requirements, no one group can hope to stimulate action; all sectors of the community must be involved. It also was maintained that the building professionals in such communities must have the tools they need to provide appropriate seismic designs and that there must be a close relationship with the code enforcement agency. In addition, it was noted that the regulatory agency must have enough trained people to provide for review of designs and to ensure enforcement of any seismic provisions adopted.

Currently in force in Seattle is the Uniform Building Code, 1979, including seismic requirements.

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY

INTRODUCTION

An important aspect of dealing with community seismic safety involves making sure that everyone "speaks the same language." If the community at large is to gain any real understanding of complex seismic issues, all of the persons involved in seismic safety activities need to understand and use the commonly accepted definitions for important terms.

GENERAL TERMS

The following definitions are from a 1984 U. S. Geological Survey Open-File Report (84-762), A Workshop on "Earthquake Hazards in the Virgin Islands Region", (Reston, Virginia: USGS):

Acceptable Risk - a probability of social or economic consequences due to earthquakes that is low enough (for example in comparison with other natural or manmade risks) to be judged by appropriate authorities to represent a realistic basis for determining design requirements for engineered structures, or for taking certain social or economic actions.

Damage - any economic loss or destruction caused by earthquakes.

Design Earthquake - a specification of the seismic ground motion at a site; used for the earthquake-resistant design of a structure.

Design Event, Design Seismic Event - a specification of one or more earthquake source parameters, and of the location of energy release with respect to the site of interest; used for the earthquake-resistant design of a structure.

Earthquake - a sudden motion or vibration in the earth caused by the abrupt release of energy in the earth's lithosphere. The wave motion may range from violent at some locations to imperceptible at others.

Elements at Risk - population, properties, economic activities, including public services etc., at risk in a given area.

Exceedence Probability - the probability that a specified level of ground motion or specified social or economic consequences of earthquakes, will be exceeded at the site or in a region during a specified exposure time.

Exposure - the potential economic loss to all or certain subset of structures as a result of one or more earthquakes in an area. This term usually refers to the insured value of structures carried by one or more insurers. See "Value at Risk."

Intensity - a qualitative or quantitative measure of the severity of seismic ground motion at a specific site (e.g., Modified Mercalli intensity, Rossi-Forel intensity, Housner Spectral intensity, Arias intensity, peak acceleration, etc.).

Loss - any adverse economic or social consequence caused by one or more earthquakes.

Seismic Event - the abrupt release of energy in the earth's lithosphere, causing an earthquake.

Seismic Hazard - any physical phenomenon (e.g., ground shaking, ground failure) associated with an earthquake that may produce adverse effects on human activities.

Seismic Risk - the probability that social or economic consequences of earthquakes will equal or exceed specified values at a site, at several sites, or in an area, during a specified exposure time.

Seismic Zone - a generally large area within which seismic-design requirements for structures are constant.

Value at Risk - the potential economic loss (whether insured or not) to all or certain subset of structures as a result of one or more earthquakes in an area. See "Exposure."

Vulnerability - the degree of loss to a given element at risk, or set of such elements, resulting from an earthquake of a given magnitude or intensity, which is usually expressed on a scale from 0 (no damage) to 10 (total loss).

The following excerpt from the 1983 National Research Council report, Multiple Hazard Mitigation (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press), defines several other terms that sometimes cause confusion in discussions of seismic safety:

... The level of intensity or severity that is capable of causing damage depends upon the vulnerability of the exposed community; vulnerability is generally a function of the way in which structures are designed, built, and protected, and the vulnerability of a structure or community to a particular natural event is a measure of the damage likely to be sustained should the event occur. The degree to which a community is prone to a particular natural hazard depends on risk, exposure, and vulnerability. When a natural hazard occurrence significantly exceeds the community's capacity to cope with it, or causes a large number of deaths and injuries or significant economic loss, it is called a disaster.

Hazard management includes the full range of organized actions undertaken by public and private organizations in anticipation of and in response to hazards. Hazard management has two primary (but not completely distinct) components: emergency

management, typified by the police, fire, rescue, and welfare work carried on during a disaster; the advance planning and training that are necessary if emergency operations are to be carried out successfully; and the post-disaster recovery period in which damage is repaired; and mitigation, which focuses on planning, engineering design, economic measures, education, and information dissemination, all carried out for the purpose of reducing the long-term losses associated with a particular hazard or set of hazards in a particular location.

MEASURES OF EARTHQUAKE MAGNITUDE AND INTENSITY

The following excerpt from the 1976 thesis, Seismic Design of a High-Rise Building, prepared by Jonathan Barnett and John Canatsoulis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science at the Worcester Polytechnic Institute explains the Richter magnitude scale and the modified Mercalli intensity scale:

There are two important earthquake parameters of interest to the structural engineer. They are an earthquake's magnitude and its intensity. The intensity is the apparent effect of an earthquake as experienced at a specific location. The magnitude is the amount of energy released by the earthquake.

The magnitude is the easiest of these two parameters to measure, as, unlike the intensity which can vary with location, the magnitude of a particular earthquake is a constant. The most widely used scale to measure magnitude is the Richter magnitude scale. Using this scale, the magnitude, measured in ergs, can be found from the equation $\log E = 11.4 + 1.5 M$, where M is the Richter magnitude. This relationship was arrived at by an analysis of the amplitude of the traces of a standard seismograph located 100 kilometers from the epicenter of an earthquake and correlating this information with the radiated energy as determined through measurements of the waves released by the earthquake. The epicenter of an earthquake is the point on the surface of the earth directly over the focus. The focus (or hypocenter) is the point in the earth's crust at which the initial rupture (slippage of masses of rock over a fault) occurs. In use, the Richter scale represents an increase by a factor of 31.6 for each unit increase in the Richter magnitude. Thus, a Richter magnitude of 6 is 31.6 times larger than Richter magnitude 5....

[A] problem with using the Richter magnitude is that it gives little indication of an earthquake's intensity. Two earthquakes of identical Richter magnitude may have widely different maximum intensities. Thus, even though an earthquake may have only one magnitude, it will have many different intensities.

In the United States, intensity is measured according to the modified Mercalli index (MMI). In Europe, the most common

intensity scale is the Rossi-Forel scale while in Russia a modification of the Mercalli scale is used.

The following excerpt from Bruce A. Bolt's 1978 book, Earthquake: A Primer (San Francisco, California: W.H. Freeman and Company), describes the modified Mercalli intensity values (1956 version); masonry definitions from C. F. Richter's 1958 book, Elementary Seismology (San Francisco, California: W. H. Freeman Company), are inserted in brackets:

- I. Not felt. Marginal and long-period effects of large earthquakes.
- II. Felt by persons at rest, on upper floors, or favorably placed.
- III. Felt indoors. Hanging objects swing. Vibration like passing of light trucks. Duration estimated. May not be recognized as an earthquake.
- IV. Hanging objects swing. Vibration like passing of heavy trucks; or sensation of a jolt like a heavy ball striking the walls. Standing cars rock. Windows, dishes, doors rattle. Glasses clink. Crockery clashes. In the upper range of IV, wooden walls and frames creak.
- V. Felt outdoors; direction estimated. Sleepers wakened. Liquids disturbed, some spilled. Small unstable objects displaced or upset. Doors swing, close, open. Shutters, pictures move. Pendulum clocks stop, start, change rate.
- VI. Felt by all. Many frightened and run outdoors. Persons walk unsteadily. Windows, dishes, glassware broken. Knickknacks, books, etc., off shelves. Pictures off walls. Furniture moved or overturned. Weak plaster and masonry D [weak materials such as adobe, poor mortar, low standards of workmanship; weak horizontally] cracked. Small bells ring (church and school). Trees, bushes shaken visibly, or heard to rustle.
- VII. Difficult to stand. Noticed by drivers. Hanging objects quiver. Furniture broken. Damage to masonry D, including cracks. Weak chimneys broken at roof line. Fall of plaster, loose bricks, stones, tiles, cornices also unbraced parapets and architectural ornaments. Some cracks in masonry C [ordinary workmanship and mortar; no extreme weaknesses like failing to tie in at corners but not reinforced or designed against horizontal forces]. Waves on ponds, water turbid with mud. Small slides and caving in along sand or gravel banks. Large bells ring. Concrete irrigation ditches damaged.

- VIII. Steering of cars affected. Damage to masonry C; partial collapse. Some damage to masonry B [good workmanship and mortar; reinforced but not designed in detail to resist lateral forces]; none to masonry A [good workmanship, mortar, and design; reinforced, especially laterally; bound together by using steel, concrete, etc.; designed to resist lateral forces]. Fall of stucco and some masonry walls. Twisting, fall of chimneys, factory stacks, monuments, towers, elevated tanks. Frame houses moved on foundations if not bolted down; loose panel walls thrown out. Decayed piling broken off. Branches broken from trees. Changes in flow or temperature of springs and wells. Cracks in wet ground and on steep slopes.
- IX. General panic. Masonry D destroyed; masonry C heavily damaged, sometimes with complete collapse; masonry B seriously damaged. General damage to foundations. Frame structures, if not bolted down, shifted off foundations. Frames racked. Serious damage to reservoirs. Underground pipes broken. Conspicuous cracks in the ground. In alluviated areas, sand and mud ejected, earthquake fountains and sand craters.
- X. Most masonry and frame structures destroyed with their foundations. Some well-built wooden structures and bridges destroyed. Serious damage to dams, dikes, embankments. Large landslides. Water thrown on banks of canals, rivers, lakes, etc. Sand and mud shifted horizontally on beaches and flat land. Rails bent slightly.
- XI. Rails bent greatly. Underground pipelines completely out of service.
- XII. Damage nearly total. Large rock masses displaced. Lines of sight and level distorted. Objects thrown in the air.

EARTHQUAKE OCCURRENCES

The following maps are included to give the reader some idea of where damaging earthquakes have occurred in the United States.




FIGURE 1 Location of damaging earthquakes in the United States. (Reproduced from Christopher Arnold's article "Quake Codes" in the spring 1984 issue of Architectural Technology.)




FIGURE 2 Notable damaging historic earthquakes in the United States. (Reproduced from Mary L. Schnell and Darrell G. Herd's 1984 report, National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program: Overview (FY 1983), Report to Congress, USGS Circular 918, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.)

APPENDIX C

SEISMIC SAFETY INFORMATION SOURCES

INTRODUCTION

This list is designed to identify potential sources of seismic safety information useful at the local level. Although the list is far from exhaustive, it does include many of the associations, organizations, and centers that provide various types of data ranging from relatively general information to specific technical guidance.

Since much information is best obtained at the local level, the reader is urged to contact local academic institutions and the local chapters of the various professional organizations.

ORGANIZATIONS

American Concrete Institute

B.O. Box 19150
Detroit, Michigan 48219
(313)532-2600

American Consulting Engineers Council

1015 15th Street, N.W., Suite 802
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)347-7474

American Institute of Architects

1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202)626-7300

American Institute of Architects Foundation

1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202)626-7421

American Institute of Steel Construction

400 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
(312)670-2400

American Insurance Association

85 John Street
New York, New York 10038
(212)669-0400

American Planning Association

1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
(312)947-2082

American Plywood Association

7011 South 19th Street
Box 11700
Tacoma, Washington 98441-0700
(206)565-6600

American Society of Civil Engineers

345 East 47th Street
New York, New York 10017-2398
(212)705-7496

American Red Cross, National Office of Disaster Assistance

18th and E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
(202)857-3718

Applied Technology Council

2471 East Bayshore Road, Suite 512
Palo Alto, California 94303
(415)856-8925

Arizona State University, Office of Hazard Studies

Center for Public Affairs
Tempe, Arizona 85287
(602)965-4518

Arkansas Earthquake Advisory Council

Arkansas Geological Commission
3815 West Roosevelt
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204
(501)663-9714

Associated General Contractors of America

1957 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202)393-2040

Association of Bay Area Governments

Metro Center
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, California 94606
(415)464-7900

Association of Engineering Geologists

Box 506
Short Hills, New Jersey 07078
(201)379-7470

Association of Major City Building Officials

200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213)485-2021

Association of the Wall and Ceiling Industries International
25 K Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202)783-2924

Bay Area Regional Earthquake Preparedness Project
Metro Center
1018th Street, Suite 152
Oakland, California 94607
(415)540-2713

Bay Area Regional Earthquake Preparedness Project Policy Advisory Board
Assistant Director, Institute of Governmental Studies
University of California
109 Moses Hall
Berkeley, California 94720
(415)642-6722

Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers
4000 N.E. 41st Street
Seattle, Washington 98105
(206)525-3130

Brick Institute of America
11490 Commerce Park Drive, Suite 300
Reston, Virginia 22091
(703)620-0010

Building Officials and Code Administrators, International
4051 West Flossmoor Road
Country Club Hills, Illinois 60477
(312)799-2300

Building Owners and Managers Association, International
1221 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)638-2929

Building Seismic Safety Council
1015 15th Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)347-5710

Business and Industry Council for Earthquake Preparedness
Director of Emergency Planning and Office Administration
Atlantic Richfield Company
515 South Flower Street
Los Angeles, California 90071
(213)486-2535

California Seismic Safety Commission
1900 K Street
Sacramento, California 95814
(916)322-4917

Canadian National Committee on Earthquake Engineering
National Research Council of Canada
Division of Building Research
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R6

Central United States Earthquake Consortium
2001 Industrial Park Drive
Box 367
Marion, Illinois 62959
(618)997-5659

Concrete Masonry Association of California and Nevada
83 Scripps Drive, Suite 303
Sacramento, California 95825
(916)920-4414

Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute
933 North Plum Grove Road
Shaumburg, Illinois 60195
(312)490-1700

Council of American Building Officials
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1201
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
(703)931-4533

Earthquake Education Center
Baptist College
P.O. Box 10087
Charleston, South Carolina 92411
(803)797-4208

Earthquake Engineering Research Institute
2620 Telegraph Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704
(415)848-0972

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Division of Earthquakes and Natural Hazards Programs
500 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20472
(202)646-2797

Governor's Earthquake and Safety Technical Advisory Panel
Kentucky Division of Disaster and Emergency
EOC Building, Boone Center
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
(502)564-8600

Governor's Earthquake Emergency Task Force
California Office of Emergency Services
2800 Meadowview Road
Sacramento, California 95832
(916)427-4285

Illinois Earthquake Advisory Board

Illinois Emergency Services and Disaster Agency
110 East Adams Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706
(217)782-4448

Indiana Earthquake Advisory Panel

Indiana Department of Civil Defense
B-90 State Office Building
100 North Senate
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317)232-3834

Insurance Information Institute

110 Williams Street
New York, New York 10038
(212)669-9200

Interagency Committee on Seismic Safety in Construction

c/o Center for Building Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Gaithersburg, MD 20899
(301)921-3377

International City Management Association

1120 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)626-4600

International Conference of Building Officials

5360 South Workman Mill Road
Whittier, California 90601
(213)699-0541

Masonry Institute of America

2550 Beverly Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90057
(213)388-0472

Masonry Institute of Washington

925 116th Street, Suite 209
Bellevue, Washington 98004
(206)453-8820

Metal Building Manufacturers Association

1230 Keith Building
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216)241-7333

Mississippi Seismic Advisory Panel

Mississippi Emergency Management Agency
P.O. Box 4501, Fondren Station
Jackson, Mississippi 39216
(601)352-9100

Missouri State Earthquake Safety Advisory Council

P.O. Box 116
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
(314)751-2321

National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Natural Disasters

2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418
(202)334-3312

National Association of Home Builders of the U.S.

15th and M Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)822-0200

National Bureau of Standards, Center for Building Technology

Room B168, Building 226
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899
(301)921-3471

National Concrete Masonry Association

2302 Horse Pen Road
Herndon, Virginia 22072
(703)435-4900

National Conference of States on Buildings Codes and Standards

481 Carlisle Road
Herndon, Virginia 22070
(703)437-0100

National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management

3126 Beltline Boulevard
Columbia, South Carolina 29204
(803)765-9286

National Elevator Industry, Inc.

1 Farm Spring
Farmington, Connecticut 06032
(212)986-1545

National Emergency Managers Association

c/o Director
Colorado Division of Disaster Emergency Services, EOC
Camp George West, Golden, Colorado 80401
(303)273-1624

National Fire Sprinkler Association

5715 West 76th Street
Los Angeles, California 90045
(914)878-4200

National Forest Products Association
1619 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202)797-5800

National Institute of Building Sciences
1015 15th Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202)347-5710

National Science Foundation, Directorate for Engineering, Fundamental Research for Emerging and Critical Engineering Systems Division
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550
(202)357-7710

Natural Disaster Resource Referral Service
P.O. Box 2208
Arlington, Virginia 22202
(703)920-7176

Natural Hazards Planning Council
Director, Planning Office
P.O. Box 3088
Christiansted, St. Croix, Virgin Islands 00820
(809)773-1082

Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center
University of Colorado, IBS 6
Campus Box 482
Boulder, Colorado 80309
(303)492-6818

New England Seismic Advisory Council (proposed)
P.O. Box 1496
400 Worcester Road
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701
(617)875-1318

Oklahoma Masonry Institute
3601 Classen Boulevard, Suite 108
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118
(405)524-8795

Portland Cement Association
5420 Old Orchard Road
Skokie, Illinois 60077
(312)966-6200

Prestressed Concrete Institute
201 North Wells Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312)346-4071

Rack Manufacturers Institute
1326 Freeport Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15238
(412)782-1624

School Education Safety and Education Project
State Seismologist
Geophysics Department, AD-50
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195
(206)545-7563

Soil and Foundation Engineers Association
P.O. Box 92630
El Taro, California 92630
(714)859-0294

South Carolina Seismic Safety Consortium
Department of Civil Engineering
The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
(803)792-7677
or
Baptist College
P.O. Box 10087
Charleston, South Carolina 29411
(803)797-4208

Southeastern United States Seismic Safety Consortium
Department of Civil Engineering
The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina
Charleston, South Carolina 29401
(803)792-7677

Southern Building Code Congress International
900 Montclair Road
Birmingham, Alabama 35213
(205)591-1853

Southern California Earthquake Preparedness Project
6850 Van Nuys Boulevard
Van Nuys, California 91405
(213)787-5103

Southern California Earthquake Preparedness Project Policy Advisory Board
Director of Emergency Planning and Office Administration
Atlantic Richfield Company
515 South Flower Street
Los Angeles, California 90071
(213)486-2535

Steel Plate Fabricators Association, Inc.

2901 Finley Road, Suite 103
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515
(312)232-8750

Structural Engineers Association of Arizona

2415 West Colter
Phoenix, Arizona 85015
(602)249-0963

Structural Engineers Association of California

217 2nd Street
San Francisco, California 94105
(415)974-5147

Structural Engineers Association of Utah

2126 South 1000 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106

Structural Engineers Association of Washington

1411 4th Avenue, Suite 1420
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206)624-7045

Technical Advisory Council

Deputy Director, State Emergency Management Office
Public Security Building 22
State Office Building Campus
Albany, New York 12226
(518)454-2156

Tennessee Earthquake Information Center

Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152
(901)454-2007

Tennessee Seismic Advisory Panel

Tennessee Emergency Management Agency
Tennessee EOC, 3041 Sidco Drive
Nashville, Tennessee 37204-1502
(615)252-3311

U.S. Geological Survey, Office of Earthquakes, Volcanoes, and Engineering

905 National Center
Reston, Virginia 22092
(703)860-6471

CSM Campus
1711 Illinois Avenue, Mail Stop 966
Golden, Colorado 80401
(303)236-1611

345 Middlefield Road, Building 1, Mail Stop 22
Menlo Park, California
(415)323-8111, Ext. 2312

**U.S. Public Health Service, National Institute of Mental Health, Center
for Mental Health--Studies of Emergencies**

5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857
(301)443-1910

U.S. Small Business Administration Disaster Assistance Division

Area 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands)
15-01 Broadway
Fair Lawn, New Jersey 07410
(201)794-8195

Area 2 (Alabama, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin)
75 Spring Street, S.W., Suite 822
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404)221-5822

Area 3 (Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas)
2306 Oak Lane, Suite 110
Grand Prairie, Texas 75051
(214)767-7571

Area 4 (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming)
P.O. Box 13795
Sacramento, California 95825
(916)484-4461

University of Delaware, Disaster Research Center

Newark, Delaware 19711
(302)451-2581

Western States Structural Engineers Association

304 Great Western Building
Spokane, Washington 99201

Western States Clay Products Association

9780 South, 5200 West
West Jordan, Utah
(801)561-1471

Western Seismic Safety Council

c/o Hugh Fowler
Washington State Department of Emergency Services
4220 East Martin Way
Olympia, Washington 98504
(206)459-9191

DATA BASES**American Geological Institute**

Indexes approximately 5,000 serials on the world's geological literature.

GeoRef
4220 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22302
(703)379-2480

Department of Agriculture

Data bases or computerized records maintained by agencies within the department include material on emergency disaster assistance, emergency loan distribution, insurance paid out for crop losses, avalanches, hail, and drought. AGRICOLA is a computerized bibliographic reference service dealing primarily with agriculture.

(301)344-3755

Earthquake Engineering Research Center Library

Extensive library on all aspects of the earthquake problem. Publications available by mail.

University of California
47th and Hoffman Boulevard
Richmond, California 94804
(415)231-9403

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Disaster Management Information System

More than 65 elements of information on presidentially declared disasters are available on magnetic tape.

FEMA/SL-DA
500 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20472
(202)382-6423

National Geophysical Data Center

Maintains an earthquake data file, photo files, and a set of data bases of direct interest to Pacific tsunami research and operations

NOAA/EDIS/NGDC
D62
Boulder, Colorado 80303
(303)497-6337

National Technical Information Service

The source for the public sale of government-sponsored research, development, and engineering reports and other analyses prepared

by federal agencies and their contractors and grantees. For general information call (703)487-4604. For information on research in progress call (703)487-4808. For information on the transfer of federal technology having potential commercial or practical applications, call (703)487-4808.

NTIS

5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

Smithsonian Institution

Provides the Scientific Event Alert Network (SEAN) that offers monthly bulletins summarizing short lived events around the world.

SEAN NHB

Smithsonian Institution
Mail Stop 129
Washington, D.C. 20560
(202)357-1511

U.S. Geological Survey

For information on the books, maps, and photographs of the USGS call the Reference Librarian at the:

National Center
(703)860-6671

or

Western Regional Library
(415)323-8111

or

Central Regional Library
(303)234-4133

USGS Circular 777, A Guide to Obtaining Information from the USGS, assists in obtaining USGS products and unpublished information and USGS Circular 817, Scientific and Technical, Spatial, and Bibliographic Data Bases of the U.S. Geological Survey, lists 223 USGS systems. Copies are available free from the:

USGS Branch of Distribution
604 Pickett Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22304.

USGS Earth Resources Observation Systems (EROS) offers a computerized reference service for searches for remote sensing data. Contact:

EROS Data Center
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57198
(605)594-6151

Geographic Information Systems, Methods, and Equipment for Land Use Planning lists many manual and computer-aided systems, systems design, and data sources for land use planners and managers. It is available as PB 286-643 from:

NTIS

5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

APPENDIX D

SELECTED SEISMIC SAFETY REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

This list of references focuses on the national arena generally and on the three specific geographic areas examined by the BSSC Committee on Societal Implications: the Mississippi Valley area; the Charleston, South Carolina, area; and the Puget Sound area. It is not intended to be an exhaustive list but rather to serve as the basis for specialized, area-specific research. Not all of the documents cited are widely available but an attempt has been made to identify the authors and/or original publication sites in sufficient detail to permit interested readers to make the necessary contacts. See also the list of information sources in the preceding section.

TOPICS COVERED

The references are presented under the following major headings:

1. Nature and Description of the Seismic Hazard
 - a. National
 - b. Mississippi Valley Area
 - c. Charleston Area
 - d. Puget Sound Area
2. Seismic Hazard Mitigation
 - a. National
 - b. Mississippi Valley Area
 - c. Puget Sound Area
3. Seismic Safety Code Development and Implementation
 - a. National
 - b. Charleston Area
4. Risk Perception and Hazard Awareness
5. Economics
6. Liability
7. Public Policy

NATURE AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SEISMIC HAZARD

National

- Algermissen, S. T. 1984. An Introduction to the Seismicity of the United States. Berkeley, California: Earthquake Engineering Research Institute.
- Algermissen, S. T., Ed. 1972. Conference on Seismic Risk Assessment for Building Standards. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Bolt, Bruce A. 1978. Earthquakes: A Primer. San Francisco: California: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Hays, Walter W., Ed. 1981. Evaluation of Regional Seismic Hazard and Risk. USGS Open File Report 81-437. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Hays, Walter W. 1981. Facing Geological and Hydrologic Hazards: Earth Science Considerations. USGS Professional Paper 1240-B. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and U.S. Geological Survey. 1979. Earthquake History of the United States (1971-1976 Supplement). USGS/NOAA Publication 41-1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce and U.S. Department of Interior.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1978. Proceedings of Conference V, Communicating Earthquake Hazard Information. USGS Open File Report 78-933. Menlo Park, California: U.S. Geological Survey.

Mississippi Valley

- Beavers, James E., Ed. 1981. Earthquake and Earthquake Engineering: The Eastern United States. 2 volumes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Inc.
- Clifton, Juanita W. 1980. Reelfoot and the New Madrid Quake. Asheville, North Carolina: Victor Publishing Company.
- Department of Earth and Atmospheric Science, St. Louis University (Missouri). 1980. The New Madrid Fault Zone: Potential for Disasters, Problems, and Information Needed for Disaster Relief Planning. Unpublished paper.
- Department of Earth Sciences, St. Louis University (Missouri). 1980. Earthquake Damage Potential in Missouri. Unpublished paper.
- Ferritto, John M. 1979. Seismic Analysis of Memphis. Technical Memorandum 51-79-18. Port Hueneme, California: U.S. Navy, Naval Construction Battalion.

- Fuller, Myron Leslie. 1912. The New Madrid Earthquake. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Fuller, M. B. 1912. The New Madrid Earthquake. USGS Bulletin 494. Reprinted by Ramfre Press, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, 1966.
- Hamilton, Robert M. 1980. "Quakes Along the Mississippi." Natural History 89 (8):70-74.
- Hamilton, R. M., and M. D. Zoback. 1979. Seismic Reflection Profile in the Northern Mo. Embayment. USGS Open File Report 79-1688. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Hays, W. W., Ed. 1981. Proceedings of Conference XV, A Workshop on Preparing and Responding to a Damaging Earthquake in the Eastern United States. USGS Open File Report 82-220. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Heyl, A. V., and F. A. McKeown. 1978. Preliminary Seismotectonic Map of Central Mississippi Valley and Environs. Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF 1011. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Johnson, Arch C., and Susan J. Nava. 1985. "Earthquake Hazard in the Memphis, Tennessee, Area." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.
- Liu, B. C., C. T. Hsieh, R. Gustafson, et al. 1979. Earthquake Risk and Damage Functions: An Integrated Preparedness and Planning Model Applied to New Madrid. Kansas City, Missouri: Midwest Research Institute. (Available from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia.)
- M & H Engineering and Memphis State University. 1974. Regional Earthquake Risk Study. Memphis, Tennessee: MATCOG/MCDD.
- Nuttli, Otto W. 1985. "Nature of the Earthquake Threat in St. Louis." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.
- Nuttli, Otto W. 1981. Evaluation of Past Studies and Identification of Needed Studies of the Effects of Major Earthquakes Occurring in the New Madrid Fault Zone. St. Louis, Missouri: St. Louis University.
- Nuttli, Otto W. 1974. "Magnitude-Recurrence Relation for Central Mississippi Valley Earthquakes." Seismological Society of America Bulletin 64 (4):1189-1207.

- Nuttli, Otto W. 1974. "The Mississippi Valley Earthquakes of 1811 and 1812." Earthquake Information Bulletin 6 (2).
- Nuttli, Otto W. 1973. "Mississippi Valley Earthquake of 1811-1812: Intensities, Groundmotion, and Magnitudes." Seismological Society of America Bulletin 63:227-248.
- Nowak, Andrzej S., and Elizabeth L. Rose Morrison. 1982. Earthquake Hazard Analysis for Commercial Buildings in Memphis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Parks, W. S., and R. W. Lounsbury. 1976. Summary of Some Current and Possible Future Environmental Problems Related to Geology and Hydrology at Memphis, Tennessee. USGS Water-Resources Investigation 76-4. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey. (Available as Report PB-264 513/AS from the National Technical Information Service.)
- Penick, James L. 1981. The New Madrid Earthquake. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Penick, James L. 1978. The New Madrid Earthquake of 1811 and 1812. Columbia: University of Missouri.
- Russ, David. 1981. "Model for Assessing Earthquake Potential and Fault Activity in the New Madrid Seismic Zone." In Earthquakes and Earthquake Engineering, edited by J. Beavers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Science.
- Street, R. L. 1980. A Compilation of Accounts Describing the Mississippi Valley Earthquake of 1811-1812. Lexington: University of Kentucky.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1983. Proceedings of Conference XVIII, Continuing Actions to Reduce Losses from Earthquakes in the Mississippi Valley Area. USGS Open File Report 1983-157. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1982. Proceedings of Conference XV, Preparing for and Responding to a Damaging Earthquake in the Eastern United States. USGS Open File Report 82-220. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1982. Investigation of the New Madrid, Missouri, Earthquake Region. USGS Professional Paper 1236. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Zoback, M. D., et al. 1980. "Recurrent Intraplate Tectonism in the New Madrid Seismic Zone. Science 209 (August).

Charleston Area

- Bollinger, G. A. 1985. "Earthquake at Charleston in 1886." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.
- Bollinger, G. A., and Ellen Mathena. 1982. "Seismicity of the Southeastern United States, July 1, 1981-December 31, 1981." South-eastern U.S. Seismic Network Bulletin (9). (Published by the Division of Earth Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.)
- Lindbergh, Charles, Ed. 1982. Earthquake Hazards and Risk in South Carolina and the Southeastern U.S. Charleston, South Carolina: Seismic Safety Consortium.
- Rankin, D. W., Ed. 1977. Studies Related to the Charleston, South Carolina, Earthquake of 1888--A Preliminary Report. USGS Professional Paper 1028. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Reagor, B. G. Seismicity Map of the State of South Carolina. USGS Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF-1225 (1:1,000,000). Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1977. Studies Related to the Charleston, South Carolina, Earthquake of 1886. USGS Professional Paper 1028. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1983. Proceedings of Conference XX, The 1886 Charleston, South Carolina, Earthquake and Its Implications for Today. USGS Open File Report 83-843. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1983. Proceedings of Conference XXIII, Continuing Actions to Reduce Potential Losses from Future Earthquakes in Arkansas and Nearby States. USGS Open File Report 83-846. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.

Puget Sound Area

- Algermissen, S. T., and S. T. Harding. 1965. The Puget Sound Earthquake of April 29, 1965. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce Coast and Geodetic Survey.
- Algermissen, S. T., Samuel T. Harding, Karl V. Steinbrugge, and William K. Cloud. N.d. The Puget Sound, Washington, Earthquake of April 29, 1965. Preliminary report for the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
- Chaney, Eric S. 1978. Geology, Man, and Nuclear Plant Sites on the Skagit. Seattle, Washington: Junior League at Seattle.

- Coombs, Howard A. 1974. Report to the Washington State Legislature from the ad hoc Committee on Geologic Hazards. Olympia: Washington State Legislature.
- Coombs, H. A., and J. D. Barksdale. 1942. "The Olympia Earthquake of November 13, 1939." Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America 32 (1).
- Crosson, R. C. 1972. "Small Earthquake Structure and Tectonics of the Puget Sound Region." Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America 62 (5).
- Freeman, Sigmund A., Joseph P. Nicoletti, Joseph B. Tyrrell, and John A. Blume and Associates. 1975. U.S. National Conference on Earthquake Engineering Proceedings, Evaluation of Existing Buildings for Seismic Risk. Oakland, California: Earthquake Engineering Research Institute.
- Gower, H. D. 1978. Tectonic Map of the Puget Sound Region, Washington. USGS Open File Report 78-426. Menlo Park, California: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Rasmussen, Norman H., R. C. Mallard, and S. W. Smith. 1974. Earthquake Hazard Evaluation of the Puget Sound Region, Washington State. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Smith, Stewart W. 1985. "Introduction to Seismological Concepts Related to Earthquake Hazards in the Pacific Northwest." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.
- Stepp, C. J. 1971. An Investigation of Earthquake Risk in the Puget Sound Area by Use of the Type I Distribution of Largest Extremes. College Park: Pennsylvania State University.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Disaster Assistance Administration. 1978. Federal Earthquake Preparedness Plan for the Puget Sound Area. Seattle, Washington: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Disaster Assistance Administration.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1975. A Study of Earthquake Losses in the Puget Sound, Washington, Area. USGS Open File Report 75-375. Menlo Park, California: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Weaver, Craig S., and Stewart W. Smith. 1982. Regional Tectonic and Earthquake Hazard Implications of a Crustal Fault Zone in Southwestern Washington. Seattle: University of Washington, Geophysics Program.

Yount, James C., and Robert S. Crosson, Eds. 1980. Proceedings of National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, Earthquake Hazards of the Puget Sound Region. USGS Open File Report 83-0019. Menlo Park, California: U.S. Geological Survey.

SEISMIC HAZARD MITIGATION

National

Applied Technology Council. 1981. An Evaluation of a Response Spectrum Approach to Seismic Design of Buildings. Palo Alto, California: Applied Technology Council.

Arnold, Christopher, and Richard K. Eisner. 1984. Planning Information for Earthquake Hazard Response and Reduction. San Mateo, California: Building Systems Development, Inc.

Beavers, James E. 1985. "Current Practices in Earthquake Preparedness and Mitigation for Critical Facilities." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.

Beavers, James E., Ed. 1981. Earthquakes and Earthquake Engineering--Eastern United States. 2 volumes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Inc.

Building Seismic Safety Council. 1984. BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Volume 2, NEHRP (National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program) Recommended Provisions for the Development of Seismic Regulations for New Buildings, Part 1--Provisions and Part 2--Commentary. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.

California Seismic Safety Commission. 1979. Hazardous Buildings: Local Programs to Improve Life Safety. Sacramento: California Seismic Safety Commission.

Earthquake Engineering Systems, Inc. 1978. A Rational Approach to Damage Mitigation in Existing Structures Exposed to Earthquakes: Phase I Report. San Francisco, California: Earthquake Engineering Systems, Inc.

Jaffe, Martin, et al. 1981. Reducing Earthquake Risks: A Planner's Guide. Chicago, Illinois: American Planning Association.

Hays, Walter W. "Evaluation of the Earthquake Ground Shaking Hazard for Earthquake Resistant Design." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.

National Research Council. 1983. Multiple Hazard Mitigation. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Nigg, Joanne, and Alvin Mushkatel. 1984. Structural Policy Issues for Seismic Hazard Mitigation. Unpublished paper. (Contact the authors at Arizona State University, Center for Public Affairs, Tempe, Arizona 85287.)

Scott, Stanley. 1982. Third International Earthquake Microzonation Conference Proceedings. 3 volumes. Seattle: University of Washington Department of Civil Engineering, Structural, and Geotechnical Engineering and Mechanics Programs.

Scott, Stanley. 1979. Policies for Seismic Safety: Elements of a State Governmental Program. Berkeley: University of California Institute of Governmental Studies.

Ward, Delbert B. 1985. "Management of Earthquake Safety Programs by State and Local Governments." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.

Mississippi Valley Area

Drabek, et al. 1983. Earthquake Mitigation Policy: The Experience of Two States. Monograph 37. Boulder: University of Colorado.

Thiel, Charles, Jr., and Ugo Morelli. 1981. "An Approach to Seismic Safety for the Central United States." In Earthquakes and Earthquake Engineering-- Eastern United States, Vol. 2, edited by J. Beavers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Science Publishers.

Puget Sound Area

Buck, Richard A. 1978. "The Puget Sound Preparedness Project." In Proceedings of Conference V, Communicating Earthquake Hazard Reduction Information. USGS Open File Report 78-933. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.

Puget Sound Council of Governments. 1975. Regional Disaster Mitigation Technical Study for the Central Puget Sound Region, Vol. II. Seattle, Washington: Puget Sound Council of Governments.

SEISMIC SAFETY CODE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

National

Algermissen, S. T., Ed. 1972. Proceedings of the Conference on Seismic Risk Assessment for Building Standards. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

- Algermissen, S. T. 1978. "Earthquake Hazard Studies and Building Codes." In Proceedings of Conference V, Communicating Earthquake Hazard Reduction Information. USGS Open File Report 78-933. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Applied Technology Council. 1984. Tentative Provisions for the Development of Seismic Regulations for Buildings. Report ATC 3-06 amended. Palo Alto, California: Applied Technology Council.
- Arnold, Christopher, and Robert Reitherman. 1982. Building Configuration and Seismic Design. New York: John Wiley.
- Berg, Glen V. 1983. Seismic Design Codes and Procedures. Berkeley, California: Earthquake Engineering Research Institute.
- Berlin, G. Lennis. N.d. Earthquake and the Urban Environment. Vol. 11. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press, Inc.
- Biggs and Grace. 1973. Seismic Response of Buildings Designed by Code for Different Earthquake Intensities. ST 358. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Department of Civil Engineering.
- Brookshire, David S. and William D. Schulze. 1980. Methods Development for Valuing Hazards Information. Laramie: University of Wyoming.
- Building Seismic Safety Council. 1984. BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Volume 2, NEHRP (National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program) Recommended Provisions for the Development of Seismic Regulations for New Buildings, Part 1--Provisions and Part 2--Commentary. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.
- California Seismic Safety Commission. 1979. Hazardous Buildings: Local Programs to Improve Life Safety. SSC 79-03. Sacramento: California Seismic Safety Commission.
- Cooke, Patrick W., and Robert M. Eisenhard. 1977. A Preliminary Examination of Building Regulations Adopted by the States and Major Cities. NBSIR-77-1390. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards.
- Culver, Charles C., et al. 1978. Plan for the Assessment and Implementation of Seismic Design Provisions for Buildings. NBSIR-78--1549. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards.
- D'Appolonia, E., and D. E. Shaw. 1981. "The Impact of Codes and Regulations in Seismic Safety." In Earthquakes and Earthquake Engineering: The Eastern United States, Vol. 1, edited by J. E. Beavers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Science Publishers.
- De Neufville, Richard. 1975. How Do We Evaluate and Choose Between Alternative Codes for Design and Performance? Report 17 of the Seismic Design Decision Analysis directed by Robert Whitman. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Department of Civil Engineering.

- Dillon, Robert M. 1985. "Development of Seismic Safety Codes." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.
- Harris, James. 1978. "Information Flow in the Development of Earthquake Provisions for Building Codes. In Proceedings of Conference V, Communicating Earthquake Hazard Reduction Information, USGS Open File Report 78-933. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Hicks, James M., Jr. 1978. Standards Referenced in the National Building Code. NBSIR-78-1490. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards.
- International Conference of Building Officials. 1980. Issues Which Affect the Role of Building Departments in Earthquake Hazard Mitigation. Whittier, California: International Conference of Building Officials.
- Krimgold, Frederick. 1977. Seismic Design Decisions for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts State Building Code. Report 32. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Department of Civil Engineering.
- Leslie, Stephen K., and J. M. Biggs. 1972. Earthquake Code Evaluation and the Effect of Seismic Design on the Cost of Buildings. Report 20 prepared as part of the Seismic Design Decision Analysis directed by Robert Whitman. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Department of Civil Engineering.
- McConnaughey, John S., Jr. 1978. An Economic Analysis of Building Code Impacts: A Suggested Approach. NBSIR-78-1528. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards.
- Mintier, J. Laurence, and Peter Arne Stromberg. 1983. "Seismic Safety at the Local Level: Does Planning Make a Difference?" California Geology 36(7).
- National Bureau of Standards. 1978. State Adopted Building Regulations for the Construction of Manufactured Buildings: An Analysis. NBSIR-781503. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards.
- National Technical Information Service. 1982. Seismic Design for Buildings and Building Codes: 1970 to November 1982. Citations from the NTIS Data Base. Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Information Service.
- Olson, Richard S., and Nilson, Douglas C. 1981. "Policies and Implementation: Enforcing the Seismic Provisions of Building Regulations." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association in Denver, Colorado, March. (Contact Olson at Arizona State University, Tempe.)

- Olson, Richard S., and Nilson, Douglas C. 1983. "California's Hazardous Structure Problem: A Political Perspective." California Geology 36(4).
- Slosson, James E., and James P. Krohn. 1977. "Effective Building Codes." California Geology (June).
- Smyrl, Elmira S., and Donna Linn Crossland. 1980. Literature Review: The Building Regulatory System. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards.
- Turner, Ralph H., et al. 1981. "Los Angeles Building and Safety Ordinance: A Case Study." In Community Response to Earthquake Threat in Southern California, Vol. 8. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Van Zandt, Jack E. 1975. The Historical Development of Building Code Earthquake Provisions. Working Paper. Menlo Park, California: SRI.
- Wyllie, Loring A. 1980. "Seismic Strengthening of Old Buildings with Modern Codes." In Proceedings of the First Seminar on U.S./Japan Cooperative Research Program in Earthquake Engineering on Repair and Retrofit of Structures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Wyner, Alan J., and Dean E. Mann. 1983. Seismic Safety Policy in California: Local Governments and Earthquakes. Santa Barbara: University of California.
- Zsutty, Theodore C., and Haresh C. Shah. 1985. "The Purpose and Effects of Earthquake Codes." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.

Charleston Area

- Leyendecker, Edgar V. 1983. Seismic Design Requirements in the Southeastern United States. In USGS Open File Report 83-843. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.
- Sharpe, Roland. 1983. Earthquake Resistant Design Considerations for the Southeastern United States. In USGS Open File Report 83-843. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey.

RISK PERCEPTION AND HAZARD AWARENESS

- Saarinen, T. F. 1979. The Relation of Hazard Awareness to Adoption of Approved Mitigation Measures. Unpublished paper. Boulder: University of Colorado (NHRAIC).
- Slovic, Paul, Baruch Fischhoff, and Sara Lichstein. 1980. "Facts and

Fears: Understanding Perceived Risk." In Societal Risk Assessment: How Safe Is Safe Enough?, edited by Richard Schiving and Walter Albers. New York: Plenum Press.

ECONOMICS

Brookshire, David S., and William D. Schulze. 1980. Methods Development for Valuing Hazard Information. Report prepared for the U.S. Geological Survey. Laramie: University of Wyoming.

Leslie, Stephen K., and J. M. Biggs. 1972. Earthquake Code Evaluation and the Effect of Seismic Design on the Cost of Buildings. Report 20 prepared as part of the Seismic Design Decision Analysis directed by Robert Whitman. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Department of Civil Engineering.

Cohen, L., and R. Noll. 1981. "The Economics of Building Codes to Resist Seismic Shock." Public Policy 29(1):1-30.

Dacy, Douglas C., and Howard Kunreuther. 1969. The Economics of Natural Disasters, Implications for Federal Policy. New York: The Free Press.

Ellson, Richard W., Jerome W. Milliman, and R. Blaine Roberts. 1982. Assessing the Regional Effects of Earthquake Predictions. Unpublished paper. Study supported by National Science Foundation Research Grant PFR 80-19826 and the College of Business Administration at the University of South Carolina.

Ferrito, John M. 1981. "Economic Review of Earthquake Design Levels." ASCE Journal of Structural Engineering (August).

Friesema, H. Paul, James Caporaso, Gerald Goldstein, Robert Lineberry, and McCleary. 1979. Aftermath--Communities After Natural Disasters. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Goodisman, Leonard D. 1983. "Disaster Relief Budgeting." Public Budgeting and Finance 3(5):89-102.

Hirschberg, J. G., P. Gordon, and W. J. Petak. 1978. Natural Hazards: Socioeconomic Impact Assessment Model. Redondo Beach, California: J. H. Wiggins Company. (NTIS No. PB294681/AS.)

Jones, Barclay G., and Miha Tomazevic, Editors. 1982. Social and Economic Aspects of Earthquakes: Proceedings of the Third International Conference Held in Bled, Yugoslavia. For copies, contact Barclay Jones, Program in Urban and Regional Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

J. H. Wiggins Company. N.d. Building Losses from Natural Disasters: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. Redondo Beach, California: J. H. Wiggins Company.

- Kunreuther, Howard, and Elissandra S. Fiore. 1966. The Alaskan Earthquake: A Case Study in the Economics of Disaster. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Defense Analysis.
- May, Peter J., and Leonard Goodisman. 1982. Problems in Formulating Disaster Relief After Mount St. Helens. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Milliman, Jerome W., and R. Blaine Roberts. 1982. Assessing the Effects of Policies on the Economic Losses of Natural Hazards. Unpublished report. Supported by National Science Foundation Grant PFR 80-19826 and the College of Business Administration, University of South Carolina.
- Mukerjee, Tapan. 1971. Economic Analysis of Natural Hazards: A Preliminary Study of Adjustments to Earthquakes and Their Costs. NHRAIC Working Paper 17. Boulder: University of Colorado.
- Palm, Risa. 1981. Real Estate and Special Study Zones Disclosure; the Response of California Homebuyers to Earthquake Hazards Information. Monograph 32. Boulder: University of Colorado.
- Palm, Risa, et al. 1983. Home Mortgage Lenders, Real Property Appraisers, and Earthquake Hazards. Boulder: University of Colorado.
- Petak, W. J., A. A. Atkisson, and P. H. Gleye. Natural Hazards: A Building Loss Mitigation Assessment. Redondo Beach, California: J.H. Wiggins Company.
- Rawie, Carol Chapman. 1981. Estimating Economic Impacts of Building Codes. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards.
- Schulze, William D., and David S. Brookshire. 1981. "An Economic Analysis of the Benefits and Costs of Seismic Building Codes." In Earthquakes and Earthquake Engineering: The Eastern United States, Vol. 1, edited by J. Beavers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Science Publishers.
- Scawthorn, Charles, et al. 1982. "The Influence of Natural Hazards on Urban Housing Location." Journal of Urban Economics (11):242-251.
- Stallings, Robert A. 1983. Making Decisions About Disasters: Policies, politics, and the Costs of Relief. Unpublished manuscript. School of Public Administration, University of Southern California.
- Weber, Stephen F. 1985. "Cost Impact of the NEHRP Recommended Provisions on the Design and Construction of Buildings." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.
- Wright, James D., Peter H. Rossi, Sonia R. Wright, and Eleanor Weber-Burdin. 1979. After the Clean-Up, Long-Range Effects of Natural Disasters. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

LIABILITY

- Association of Bay Area Governments. 1979. Attorney's Guide to Earthquake Liability. Berkeley, California: Association of Bay Area Governments.
- Association of Bay Area Governments. 1979. Will Local Government Be Liable for Earthquake Losses. Berkeley, California: Association of Bay Area Governments.
- Association of Bay Area Governments. 1978. Experiences and Perceptions of Local Governments on Earthquake Hazards. Berkeley, California: Association of Bay Area Governments.
- Association of Bay Area Governments. 1978. Legal References on Earthquake Hazards and Local Government Liability. Berkeley, California: Association of Bay Area Governments.
- Association of Bay Area Governments. N.d. Earthquake Hazards and Local Government Liability: Executive Summary. Berkeley, California: Association of Bay Area Governments.
- Huffman, J. L. 1982. Government Liability for Harm Resulting from Earthquake Prediction and Hazard Mitigation, A Preliminary Report on a Comparative Study. Portland, Oregon: Lewis and Clarke College Law School.
- National Association of Attorneys General. 1979. Report of the Special Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General on Earthquake Prediction, Warnings, and Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Attorneys General.

PUBLIC POLICY

- Lambright, W. Henry. N.d. Agenda Setting for Earthquake Preparedness: Lessons from New York State. Unpublished paper. (Contact the author at Syracuse Research Corporation, Merrill Lane, Syracuse, New York 13210-4080.)
- Lambright, W. Henry. N.d. Earthquake Preparedness: The Dynamics of Long-Term Policy Innovation. Unpublished paper. (Contact the author at Syracuse Research Corporation, Merrill Lane, Syracuse, New York 13210-4080.)
- Lambright, W. Henry. 1982. "Policy Innovation in Earthquake Preparedness: A Longitudinal Study of Three States." Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Denver, Colorado, September 2-5.
- Nilson, Douglas. 1984. "How to Gain the Attention and Commitment of Political officials: An Earthquake Primer." In Primer on Improving the State of Earthquake Hazards Mitigation and Preparedness, edited by Paula L. Gori. USGS Open File Report 84-772. Reston, Virginia:

U.S. Geological Survey.

Nilson, Douglas C., and Linda B. Nilson. 1981. "Seismic Safety Planning Strategies: Lessons from California." In Earthquakes and Earthquake Engineering: The Eastern United States, edited by James E. Beavers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Science Publishers.

Olson, R. S., and Douglas Nilson. 1980. "Public Policy Analyses and Hazard Research: Natural Complements." Social Science Journal (Fall):1-25.

Petak, William J., Editor. 1985. Public Administration Review 45(January). Special Issue on Emergency Management: A Challenge for Public Administration.

Rubin, Claire B. 1985. "Summary of Recent Research on Local Public Policy and Seismic Safety Mitigation." In BSSC Program on Improved Seismic Safety Provisions, Societal Implications: Selected Readings. Washington, D.C.: Building Seismic Safety Council.

Wyner, Alan J. 1984. "Earthquake and Public Policy Implementation in California." International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters 2(August).

Wyner, Alan J., and Dean E. Mann. 1983. Seismic Safety Policy in California: Local Governments and Earthquakes. Santa Barbara: University of California, Department of Political Science.